28th January 1929]

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to question No. 1050 asked by Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 28th January 1929, page 56 supra.]

Q.	A.
Q. (a) Whether it is a fact that the Hissa eri of Matam village, Wandiwash taluk, North Arcot district, is irrigating wet double-crop lands of Matam and Isakolathur villages.	(a) The Hissa eri of Matam village, Wandiwash taluk, irrigates an extent of 6·84 acres of double-crop lands (wet) in Matam and 26 cents in Isakolathur village.
(b) Whether it is a fact that the supply from this eri is insufficient and whether Government on the petitions of the ryots promised to repair the tank and asked the ryots to remove the prickly-pear on the bund of the eri.	(b) The tank in its present condition can hold five months' supply at a time which is its registered capacity. The supply from the tank cannot, therefore, be said to be insufficient for irrigation. The ayacutdars were asked to remove the prickly-pear from the tank bund to facilitate the execution of repair to the bund for which an estimate for Rs. 2,260 has been prepared.
(c) Whether it is a fact that the ryots cleared the bunds accordingly at a cost of about Rs 500.	(c) The ryots did not remove the prickly-pear from the tank bund under kudimaramat in response to the notice issued to them. An estimate for Rs. 490 for the removal of prickly-pear was therefore sanctioned for execution in the current year at the cost of the ayacutdars. The amount has been collected from the ryots and the work is being executed by a contractor under the supervision of the Minor Irrigation staff.
(d) Whether it is a fact that it is proposed to assign the foreshore lands in the same survey No. 124/2 to Adi-Dravidas and whether the caste ryots have protested against such exclusive assignment.	(d) Some of the Adi-Dravidas of Isakolathur applied for the assignment of about 50 acres of foreshore lands in S. No. 124/2 classed as tank poramboke and they were informed that no portion of the field would be assigned to them and that they might apply for other lands reserved for them.
(e) Whether it is a fact that a number of darkhast applications were dismissed in previous years for the same land and if so whether the applicants were caste ryots and the reasons why they were dismissed.	(e) Applications for the assignment of the field received in previous years (from Adi-Dravidas and caste ryots) were rejected for the reason that the land was required for the tank.